UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/868,664	09/26/2001	Stewart Mark Nichols	05222.00161	3001

29638 7590 03/09/2004

BANNER & WITCOFF AND ATTORNEYS FOR ACCENTURE
10 S. WACKER DRIVE, 30TH FLOOR
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER	
BELL, MELTIN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2121	8

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/868,664	NICHOLS, STEWART MARK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Meltin Bell	2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 September 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *1-10 and 12* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *26 September 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *5/2-7-02*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to application **09/868,664** filed 09/26/01.

Claims 1-18 have been examined.

Priority

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for priority based on application 09/218,478 filed in the United States on **12/22/98**.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant is respectfully reminded of the ongoing Duty to disclose 37 C.F.R. 1.56 all pertinent information and material pertaining to the patentability of applicant's claimed invention, by submitting in a timely manner PTO-1449, Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) with the filing of applicant's application or thereafter.

The information disclosure statement filed 2/7/02 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because of missing or inaccurate information in the listing:

The information disclosure statement filed 2/7/02 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because of missing or inaccurate information in the listing:

- Many references are missing the date of publication. Examples include
    - o "Evaluating the effectiveness of feedback in SQL-tutor"
    - o "Automated Training of Legal Reasoning" and related web page

- "CAPTOR a model for delivering web based intelligent tutoring system technology"
- "KBLPS Overview" and related web page
- "Practical methods for automatically generating typed links"
- "Teaching Real-World Analysis Skills for Goal Based Scenario".

It has been placed in the application file. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 ¶ C(1).

Drawings

The United States Patent and Trademark Office of Draftsperson's Patent Drawings Review have reviewed the formal drawings.

The drawings have not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is required in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the drawings.

The drawings are objected to because:

- Fig. 2 is missing item 234, the mathematical modeling tool of page 3, line 40.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is required in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- Figure 2, item 230 System Dynamics Engine is referred to as set of messages on page 3, line 33 and Solution Construction Aid (SCA) on page 3, line 39.
- Figure 2, item 250 System Dynamics Model (PowerSim) is referred to as knowledge system on page 4, line 1.
- Figure 2, item 270 Intelligent Coaching Agent (C++) is referred to as software tutor on page 4, line 3.
- Figure 2, item 240 Simulation Engine is referred to as artificial intelligence engine on page 4, line 3.
- Figure 2, item 242 Deliver Feedback is referred to as client cultural messages on page 4, line 5.
- Figure 2, item 238 Inputs Outputs is referred to as drag and drop association of information on page 4, line 8.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-10 and 12 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding claim 1:

- The following 101 rejection of claims 1-2 suggest claim 1's "the computer program" limitation in line 6 should be replaced with "the computer-implemented method".

Regarding claim 2:

- Claim 1 suggests claim 2's 'A method for **executing** a presentation as recited in claim 1' should be 'A method for **creating** a presentation' as recited in claim 1'.

Regarding claim 3:

- Claim 1 suggests claim 3's 'A method for **executing** a presentation as recited in claim 1' should be 'A method for **creating** a presentation' as recited in claim 1'.

- The following 101 rejection of claims 1-2 suggests claim 3's "the computer program" limitation in line 2 should be replaced with "the computer-implemented method".

Regarding claim 4:

- Claim 1 suggests claim 4's 'A method for **executing** a presentation as recited in claim 1' should be 'A method for **creating** a presentation' as recited in claim 1'.

Regarding claim 5:

- Claim 1 suggests claim 5's 'A method for **executing** a presentation as recited in claim 1' should be 'A method for **creating** a presentation' as recited in claim 1'.

Regarding claim 6:

- Claim 1 suggests claim 6's 'A method for **executing** a presentation as recited in claim 1' should be 'A method for **creating** a presentation' as recited in claim 1'.

Regarding claim 7:

- Claim 1 suggests claim 7's 'A method for **executing** a presentation as recited in claim 1' should be 'A method for **creating** a presentation' as recited in claim 1'.

Regarding claim 8:

- Claim 1 suggests claim 8's 'A method for **executing** a presentation as recited in claim 1' should be 'A method for **creating** a presentation' as recited in claim 1'. This claim is also a duplicate of claim 9. One of them should be removed.

Regarding claim 9:

- Claim 1 suggests claim 9's 'A method for **executing** a presentation as recited in claim 1' should be 'A method for **creating** a presentation' as recited in claim 1'.

Regarding claim 10:

- limitations of the claim are ordered (b) through (g) instead of (a) through (f).

- The following 101 rejection of claims 1-2 suggests claim 10's "the computer program" limitation in line 8 should be replaced with "the computer-implemented method".

Regarding claim 12:

- The following 101 rejection of claims 1-2 suggests claim 12's "the computer program" limitation in line 2 should be replaced with "the computer-implemented method".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As methods, claim 1-9 offer abstract ideas (e.g. "goal", "presentation", "instantiating") that are also not embodied in the technological arts. Abstract ideas and their manipulation constitute "descriptive material" that is not patentable, *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759 and *Schrader*, 22 F.3d at 292-93, 30 USPQ2d at 1457-58, respectively. If claim 1 was amended to recite a computer-implemented method, it will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. For examples,

- *AT&T Corp. v. Excel Communications Inc.*, (CA FC) 50 USPQ2d 1447 (Fed. Cir. 1999)
- *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group,* (CA FC) 47 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1998)
- *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1360-61, 31 USPQ2d at 1759 offers product-by-process claim to computer having a specific data structure stored in memory also held statutory while
- *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 offers claim to a data structure *per se* held nonstatutory.

Because the ideas are not claimed to be practiced on a computer and/or stored on a computer readable medium, they are not limited to practical applications in the technological arts. Specifically, the claims are methods without any particular practical application, such as a program running on a computer and stored in a computer readable medium or memory. On that basis alone, those claims are clearly nonstatutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

To expedite a complete examination of the instant application, the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of applicant amending these claims to place them within the four statutory categories of invention.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Cook et al* W.I.P.O. International Publication Number WO 97/44766 A1 (November 27, 1997) in view of *Zeller et al* "DDD – A Free Graphical Front-End for Unix Debuggers"

(January 1, 1996) and further in view of *Hayes et al* United States Patent Number 5,170,464.

Regarding claim 1:

Cook et al teaches,

- (a) presenting information indicative of a goal (Fig. 4)

- (b) integrating information that motivates accomplishment of the goal (page 8, lines 1-15, "it accepts data...appropriate candidate behaviors")

- (c) monitoring progress toward the goal and providing feedback that further motivates accomplishment of the goal (page 10, lines 24-31, "A further important...student's pedagogic characteristics")

However, *Cook et al* doesn't explicitly teach displaying details of the computer program as the presentation executes while *Zeller et al* teaches,

- (d) displaying details of the computer program as the presentation executes (Abstract, sentences 1-5, "The Data Display Debugger...current variable values")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed method would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Low cost competitive performance (*Zeller et al*, Abstract, sentence 6, "DDD has been ...general public license")
- Individualized interaction (*Cook et al*, page 7, lines 19-29, "An important object...of student behavior")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Cook et al* with *Zeller et al* to obtain the invention

specified in claim 1, a method for creating a presentation. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to inexpensively personalize feedback to the program user.

Regarding claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Claim 2's further limitations are taught in *Cook et al*:

- the step of instantiating a particular feedback model based on characteristics of a target user (page 21, lines 23-27, "In the ABI...student's interactive instruction")

Therefore, claim 2 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Regarding claim 3:

Cook et al teaches,

- (a) presenting information indicative of a goal (Fig. 4)
- (b) integrating information that motivates accomplishment of the goal (page 8, lines 1-15, "it accepts data...appropriate candidate behaviors")
- (c) monitoring progress toward the goal and providing feedback that further motivates accomplishment of the goal (page 10, lines 24-31, "A further important...student's pedagogic characteristics")

However, *Cook et al* doesn't explicitly teach displaying details of the computer program as the presentation executes or the step of receiving and analyzing user responses using an expert system to determine details of the computer program to display while *Zeller et al* teaches,

- (d) displaying details of the computer program as the presentation executes (Abstract, sentences 1-5, "The Data Display Debugger...current variable values")

Hayes et al teaches,

- the step of receiving and analyzing user responses using an expert system to determine details of the computer program to display (Abstract, "A system and...corresponding executable state")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed method would have been highly desirable feature in this art for

- Simplified correction of programming errors (*Hayes et al,* column 2, line 68, "It would be desirable for a"; column 3, lines 1-5, "debugger suitable for...correcting programming errors")
- Low cost competitive performance (*Zeller et al*, Abstract, sentence 6, "DDD has been ...general public license")
- Individualized interaction (*Cook et al*, page 7, lines 19-29, "An important object...of student behavior")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Cook et al* with *Zeller et al* and *Hayes et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 3, a method for creating a presentation. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to simply and inexpensively personalize feedback to the programmer.

Regarding claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Claim 4's further limitations are taught in *Cook et al*:

- the step of browsing details of an object as the presentation executes (page 23, paragraphs 2-3, "Here is a...array size explicitly")

Therefore, claim 4 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Regarding claim 5:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Therefore, claim 5 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Regarding claim 6:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Therefore, claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Regarding claim 7:

Cook et al teaches,

- (a) presenting information indicative of a goal (Fig. 4)

- (b) integrating information that motivates accomplishment of the goal (page 8, lines 1-15, "it accepts data...appropriate candidate behaviors")

- (c) monitoring progress toward the goal and providing feedback that further motivates accomplishment of the goal (page 10, lines 24-31, "A further important...student's pedagogic characteristics")

However, *Cook et al* doesn't explicitly teach displaying details of the computer program as the presentation executes or the step of capturing portions of the presentation in response to a user indicia as the presentation executes while *Zeller et al* teaches,

- (d) displaying details of the computer program as the presentation executes (Abstract, sentences 1-5, "The Data Display Debugger...current variable values")

Hayes et al teaches,

- the step of capturing portions of the presentation in response to a user indicia as the presentation executes (Abstract, "A system and...corresponding executable state")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed method would have been highly desirable feature in this art for

- Simplified correction of programming errors (*Hayes et al,* column 2, line 68, "It would be desirable for a"; column 3, lines 1-5, "debugger suitable for...correcting programming errors")
- Low cost competitive performance (*Zeller et al*, Abstract, sentence 6, "DDD has been ...general public license")
- Individualized interaction (*Cook et al*, page 7, lines 19-29, "An important object...of student behavior")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Cook et al* with *Zeller et al* and *Hayes et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 7, a method for creating a presentation. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would

have been motivated to simply and inexpensively personalize feedback to the programmer.

Regarding claim 8:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Claim 8's further limitations are taught in *Cook et al*:

- the step of tailoring feedback based on a user indicia as the presentation executes (page 109, lines 18-31, "Exemplary educational paradigms ... student performance data")

Therefore, claim 8 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Regarding claim 9:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Claim 9's further limitations are taught in *Cook et al*:

- the step of presenting a tailored simulation based on a user indicia as the presentation executes (page 109, lines 18-31, "Exemplary educational paradigms ... student performance data")

Therefore, claim 9 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Regarding claim 10:

Cook et al teaches,

- (b) a processor (page 29, lines 20-22, "A NC is...or the Internet")

- (c) a memory that stores information under the control of the processor (page 29, lines 15-17, "student client system...a backing store")

- (d) logic that presents information indicative of a goal (Fig. 4)

- (e) logic that integrates information that motivates accomplishment of the goal (page 8, lines 1-15, "it accepts data...appropriate candidate behaviors")

- (f) logic that monitors progress toward the goal and provides feedback that further motivates accomplishment of the goal (page 10, lines 24-31, "A further important...student's pedagogic characteristics")

However, *Cook et al* doesn't explicitly teach logic that displays details of the computer program as the presentation executes while *Zeller et al* teaches,

- (d) logic that displays details of the computer program as the presentation executes (Abstract, sentences 1-5, "The Data Display Debugger...current variable values")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed apparatus would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Low cost competitive performance (*Zeller et al*, Abstract, sentence 6, "DDD has been ...general public license")
- Individualized interaction (*Cook et al*, page 7, lines 19-29, "An important object...of student behavior")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Cook et al* with *Zeller et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 10, an apparatus for creating a presentation. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to inexpensively personalize feedback to the program user.

Regarding claim 11:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Claim 2's further limitations are taught in *Cook et al*:

- logic that instantiates a particular feedback model based on characteristics of a target user (page 21, lines 23-27, "In the ABI... student's interactive instruction")

Therefore, claim 2 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Regarding claim 12:

Cook et al teaches,

- (b) a processor (page 29, lines 20-22, "A NC is... or the Internet")

- (c) a memory that stores information under the control of the processor (page 29, lines 15-17, "student client system... a backing store")

- (d) logic that presents information indicative of a goal (Fig. 4)

- (e) logic that integrates information that motivates accomplishment of the goal (page 8, lines 1-15, "it accepts data... appropriate candidate behaviors")

- (f) logic that monitors progress toward the goal and provides feedback that further motivates accomplishment of the goal (page 10, lines 24-31, "A further important... student's pedagogic characteristics")

However, *Cook et al* doesn't explicitly teach logic that displays details of the computer program as the presentation executes or logic that receives and analyzes user responses using an expert system to determine details of the computer program to display while *Zeller et al* teaches,

- (d) logic that displays details of the computer program as the presentation executes (Abstract, sentences 1-5, "The Data Display Debugger...current variable values")

Hayes et al teaches,

- logic that receives and analyzes user responses using an expert system to determine details of the computer program to display (Abstract, "A system and...corresponding executable state"; Figs. 1, 5, 9)

Motivation – The portions of the claimed apparatus would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Simplified correction of programming errors (*Hayes et al,* column 2, line 68, "It would be desirable for a"; column 3, lines 1-5, "debugger suitable for...correcting programming errors")
- Low cost competitive performance (*Zeller et al*, Abstract, sentence 6, "DDD has been ...general public license")
- Individualized interaction (*Cook et al*, page 7, lines 19-29, "An important object...of student behavior")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Cook et al* with *Zeller et al* and *Hayes et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 12, an apparatus for creating a presentation. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to inexpensively personalize feedback to the programmer.

Regarding claim 13:

The rejection of claim 10 is incorporated. Claim 13's further limitations are taught in *Cook et al*:

- logic that browses details of an object as the presentation executes (page 23, paragraphs 2-3, "Here is a...array size explicitly")

Therefore, claim 13 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 10.

Regarding claim 14:

The rejection of claim 10 is incorporated. Therefore, claim 14 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 10.

Regarding claim 15:

The rejection of claim 10 is incorporated. Therefore, claim 15 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 10.

Regarding claim 16:

Cook et al teaches,

- (b) a processor (page 29, lines 20-22, "A NC is...or the Internet")

- (c) a memory that stores information under the control of the processor (page 29, lines 15-17, "student client system...a backing store")

- (d) logic that presents information indicative of a goal (Fig. 4)

- (e) logic that integrates information that motivates accomplishment of the goal (page 8, lines 1-15, "it accepts data...appropriate candidate behaviors")

- (f) logic that monitors progress toward the goal and provides feedback that further motivates accomplishment of the goal (page 10, lines 24-31, "A further important...student's pedagogic characteristics")

However, *Cook et al* doesn't explicitly teach logic that displays details of the computer program as the presentation executes or logic that captures portions of the presentation in response to a user indicia as the presentation executes while *Zeller et al* teaches,

- (d) logic that displays details of the computer program as the presentation executes (Abstract, sentences 1-5, "The Data Display Debugger...current variable values")

Hayes et al teaches,

- logic that captures portions of the presentation in response to a user indicia as the presentation executes (Abstract, "A system and...corresponding executable state"; Figs. 1, 5, 9)

Motivation – The portions of the claimed apparatus would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Simplified correction of programming errors (*Hayes et al,* column 2, line 68, "It would be desirable for a"; column 3, lines 1-5, "debugger suitable for...correcting programming errors")
- Low cost competitive performance (*Zeller et al*, Abstract, sentence 6, "DDD has been ...general public license")
- Individualized interaction (*Cook et al*, page 7, lines 19-29, "An important object...of student behavior")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine *Cook et al* with *Zeller et al* and *Hayes et al* to obtain the invention specified in claim 16, an apparatus for creating a presentation. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to inexpensively personalize feedback to the programmer.

Regarding claim 17:

The rejection of claim 10 is incorporated. Claim 17's further limitations are taught in *Cook et al*:

- logic that tailors feedback based on a user indicia as the presentation executes (page 109, lines 18-31, "Exemplary educational paradigms ... student performance data")

Therefore, claim 17 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 10.

Regarding claim 18:

The rejection of claim 10 is incorporated. Claim 187's further limitations are taught in *Cook et al*:

- logic that presents a tailored simulation based on a user indicia as the presentation executes (page 109, lines 18-31, "Exemplary educational paradigms ... student performance data")

Therefore, claim 18 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 10.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- *Cook et al*; W.I.P.O. Int'l. Pub. Num. WO 97/44766 A1

- *Zeller et al* ; DDD—a free graphical front-end for UNIX debuggers; ACM SIGPLAN Notices; January 1996; Vol. 31, Iss. 1

- *Hayes et al*; USPN 5,170,464

- *Kim*; USPN 5,673,369; Authoring Knowledge Based Systems Using Interactive Directed Graphs

- *Amado*; USPN 5,701,400; Method and Apparatus for Applying If-Then-Else Rules to Data Sets in a Relational Data Base and Generating from the Results of Application of Said Rules a Database of Diagnostics Linked to Said Data Sets to Aid Executive Analysis of Financial Data

- *Beams et al*; USPN 6,611,822; System Method and Article of Manufacture for Creating Collaborative Application Sharing

- *Kingma*; PCT International Search Report; 18 October 1999 int'l search completion, 03.11.1999 int'l search report mailed

- *Simonini, Dolezel*; PCT/US99/02654 International Preliminary Examination Report; 24/07/2000 demand submission date, 23.03.2001 report completion date

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Office should be directed to Meltin Bell whose telephone number is 703-305-0362. This Examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 7:30 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach this Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, his supervisor, Anil Khatri, can be reached on 703-305-0282. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

MB /M.M.

Ramesh Patel
RAMESH PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER 3/5/04
For Anil Khatri